

CONFERENCE ON DISTRIBUTION OF TEXTBOOKS  
AND  
EDUCATIONAL AIDS FOR BLIND CHILDREN

DODGE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

NOVEMBER 1ST AND 2ND, 1961

SPONSORED BY THE  
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF INSTRUCTORS OF THE BLIND, INC.  
MISS LOIS V. COX, *President*

WITH THE COOPERATION OF THE  
AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND, INC.  
DR. M. ROBERT BARNETT, *Executive Director*

GENERAL CHAIRMAN  
DR. EDWARD J. WATERHOUSE  
*Chairman, A.A.I.B. Legislative Committee*  
*Director, Perkins School for the Blind*

HV 1667  
C



**M.C. MIGEL LIBRARY**  
**AMERICAN PRINTING**  
**HOUSE FOR THE BLIND**

H V 1667 C1  
C  
copy

CONFERENCE ON DISTRIBUTION OF TEXTBOOKS  
AND  
EDUCATIONAL AIDS FOR BLIND CHILDREN

DODGE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

NOVEMBER 1ST AND 2ND, 1961

SPONSORED BY THE  
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF INSTRUCTORS OF THE BLIND, INC.

MISS LOIS V. COX, *President*

WITH THE COOPERATION OF THE  
AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND, INC.  
DR. M. ROBERT BARNETT, *Executive Director*

GENERAL CHAIRMAN  
DR. EDWARD J. WATERHOUSE  
*Chairman, A.A.I.B. Legislative Committee*  
*Director, Perkins School for the Blind*

## ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

- ANDREWS, DR. FRANK M., *Legislative Committee*  
American Association of Instructors of the Blind, Inc.  
c/o Maryland School for the Blind  
Taylor Avenue, Overlea 6, Maryland
- BARNETT, DR. M. ROBERT, *Executive Director*  
American Foundation for the Blind, Inc.  
15 West 16th Street, New York 11, New York
- BRAY, MR. ROBERT, *Chief*  
Division for the Blind  
Library of Congress, Washington 25, D. C.
- BRYAN, MRS. DOROTHY, *Consultant*  
Division of Special Education of Blind and Partially Seeing  
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Springfield, Illinois
- CARTER, MR. BURNHAM, *National Director*  
Recording for the Blind  
121 East 58th Street, New York, New York
- COX, MISS LOIS V., *President*  
American Association of Instructors of the Blind, Inc.  
c/o Maryland School for the Blind  
Taylor Avenue, Overlea 6, Maryland
- DAVIS, MR. FINIS E., *Superintendent and First Vice President*  
American Printing House for the Blind, Inc.  
1839 Frankfort Avenue, Louisville 6, Kentucky
- DOYLE, DR. F. W., *Deputy Superintendent*  
Chief, Division of Special Schools and Services  
Department of Education  
State Education Building  
721 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento 14, California
- EISNAUGLE, MISS EVELYN  
Division of Special Education  
State Department of Education  
40 South Third Street, Columbus 15, Ohio
- EMANUELE, MR. GEORGE J., *Director*  
Medical and Social Services  
Florida Council for the Blind  
P. O. Box 1229, Tampa, Florida
- GEER, DR. WILLIAM, *Executive Secretary*  
Council for Exceptional Children  
1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.
- GIBBONS, MISS HELEN, *Consultant in Education*  
National Society for the Prevention of Blindness  
16 East 40th Street, New York 16, New York

- GRUBER, MISS KATHERN F., *Director*  
 Bureau of Research of Statistics  
 American Foundation for the Blind, Inc.  
 15 West 16th Street, New York 11, New York
- HOOPER, MISS MARJORIE S., *Braille and Large-type Editor*  
 American Printing House for the Blind, Inc.  
 1839 Frankfort Avenue, Louisville 6, Kentucky
- JONES, MR. JOHN W., *Consultant on the Visually Handicapped*  
 Office of Education  
 Department of Health, Education and Welfare  
 Washington 25, D. C.
- KEANE, MR. GEORGE F., *Chairman, Legislative Committee*  
 American Association of Workers for the Blind  
 c/o Industrial Home for the Blind  
 57 Willoughby Street, Brooklyn, New York
- LONG, MISS ELINOR H., *Supervisor*  
 Blind and Partially Sighted  
 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
 Department of Public Instruction  
 Box 911, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
- LOWN, MR. F. ARTHUR  
 746 Amsterdam Avenue, Atlanta 6, Georgia
- MACKIE, DR. ROMAINE P., *Chief, Exceptional Children and Youth*  
 Office of Education  
 Department of Health, Education and Welfare  
 Washington 25, D. C.
- MARCHISIO, MR. GUY, *Chief of Children's Services*  
 Board of Education of the Blind  
 State Office Building, Hartford 15, Connecticut
- MORRIS, MISS EFFIE LEE, *Children's Specialist*  
 Library for the Blind  
 The New York Public Library  
 166 Avenue of the Americas, New York 13, New York
- NAGLE, MR. JOHN, *Washington Representative*  
 National Federation of the Blind, Inc.  
 1908 Que Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.
- NOLAN, DR. CARSON Y., *Director of Educational Research*  
 American Printing House for the Blind, Inc.  
 1839 Frankfort Avenue, Louisville 6, Kentucky
- O'KEEFE, MR. JAMES  
 Services for the Blind  
 Department of Public Welfare  
 Centennial Building, St. Paul 1, Minnesota

- OLSEN, MR. MAURICE, *Executive Secretary*  
American Association of Instructors of the Blind, Inc.  
2363 South Spring Avenue, St. Louis 10, Missouri
- SCHLOSS, MR. IRVIN P., *Legislative Analyst*  
American Foundation for the Blind, Inc.  
Investment Building, Room 442  
1511 K Street, N. W., Washington 5, D. C.
- STOW, MRS. ADA, *Executive Director*  
American Parents Committee  
132 Third Street, S. E., Washington, D. C.
- STRINGHAM, MR. LUTHER, *Director, Office of Program Analysis*  
Office of Education  
Department of Health, Education and Welfare  
Washington 25, D. C.
- TAYLOR, MISS JOSEPHINE, *Director of Educational Services*  
New Jersey State Commission for the Blind  
1100 Raymond Boulevard, Newark 2, New Jersey
- TAYLOR, MR. JOHN, *President*  
National Federation of the Blind, Inc.  
614 36th Street, South, Des Moines, Iowa
- WALKER, MR. HULEN C., *Executive Secretary*  
American Association of Workers for the Blind  
1511 K Street, N. W., Washington 5, D. C.
- WATERHOUSE, DR. EDWARD J., *Chairman, Legislative Committee*  
American Association of Instructors of the Blind, Inc.  
c/o Perkins School for the Blind  
175 North Beacon Street, Watertown 72, Massachusetts
- WHITTEN, MR. E. B., *Executive Director*  
National Rehabilitation Association  
1025 Ermont Avenue, N. W., Washington 5, D. C.
- WILCOX, DR. EVERETT, *Program Specialist in Education*  
American Foundation for the Blind, Inc.  
15 West 16th Street, New York 11, New York
- WOOLLY, MR. J. M., *Legislative Committee*  
American Association of Instructors of the Blind, Inc.  
c/o Arkansas School for the Blind  
2600 West Markham, Little Rock, Arkansas

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN

This meeting is the result of a suggestion made by Dr. M. Robert Barnett, Executive Director of the American Foundation for the Blind. Our general purpose, to quote Dr. Barnett, is to consider "Where we go from here," now that a new chapter in the history of the American Printing House for the Blind is beginning with the enactment of legislation by Congress in September, 1961.

The new legislation, which will be discussed today, omitted some features which seem to require further consideration. This, too, is on our agenda.

There are other legislative possibilities, some of which are contained in suggestions put forth by the Council for Exceptional Children, which you will wish to consider also.

Finally, there is a clear need for all of us who accept responsibilities for the education of blind children to compare our thinking and to coordinate our plans so that hopefully we may present a united front in approaching Congress.

I am sure we are all encouraged to find so many agencies represented here today. Of agencies invited by the American Association of Instructors of the Blind, only one was unable to accept.

★ ★ ★ ★

Miss Lois Cox, President of the A. A. I. B. and official hostess of the meetings, welcomed the delegates.

Dr. Barnett, Executive Director of the American Foundation for the Blind which co-sponsored the meetings, promised the support of his agency to the A. A. I. B. in calling meetings of this type. He hoped we would go beyond a discussion of the new American Printing House legislation and consider the future from a wider basis.

Mr. Luther Stringham, Assistant to the Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, greeted the delegates and conveyed to them the good wishes of Dr. Wilbur J. Cohen, the Assistant Secretary in Charge of Legislation.

★ ★ ★ ★

The Chairman then requested Mr. Davis to present his paper.

### INTERPRETATION OF LEGISLATION DEALING WITH APH

FINIS E. DAVIS, *Vice-President and General Manager*  
American Printing House for the Blind

In presenting to this group the effect of recent amendments to the basic legislation concerning the Act "To Promote the Education of the Blind," it occurs to me that it might be valuable to this discussion to make a complete summary of the provisions of the original Act, the amendments thereto, and certain departmental rulings through the years. Additionally, it seems to me that a chronological approach

would be helpful, so that the original purposes of the Act itself, and the changes in its language and administration, may be shown to have followed the growth of education of the blind in this country. Briefly, therefore, I shall try to give a historical summary of the Federal Act and the changes which have obtained over the past eighty-two years.

#### ORIGINAL LEGISLATION OF 1879

In addition to the usual fiscal controls for proper handling of funds, bonding Printing House personnel, and effective reporting for Government purposes, the original Act made the following provisions:

1. That a perpetual trust fund would be set up which would provide a sum of \$10,000 per year for purposes of the Act.
2. That the monies provided under the perpetual trust fund would be paid over to the American Printing House for the Blind semi-annually, such funds to be used to defray the labor and cost of materials, plus a reasonable amount of overhead, for the manufacture of educational materials for blind students being educated in public educational institutions for the blind throughout the nation.
3. That, on the first Monday in January of each year, a registration of the blind students in public educational institutions for the blind in the United States and its territories and possessions should be taken.
4. That such registration should be used to determine a per capita allotment to each public educational institution for the blind, by dividing the total of registrations into the \$10,000 perpetual annual appropriation, and that the quota allotments so determined should be placed on the books of the Printing House in favor of the public educational institutions for the blind each July 1st (following the January registrations), for the purpose of providing educational materials to each institution on order of its executive head.
5. That the executive heads of each public educational institution for the blind in the United States, its territories and possessions, should be ex-officio a member of the Board of Trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind (as agents of the United States Government for purposes of administering the Act).
6. That all materials provided under the Act should be "manufactured at" the American Printing House for the Blind.
7. That no part of the funds provided through the Federal Act should be used for the purpose of erecting or leasing of buildings to house the manufacture of materials to be provided under the Act.

For the record, every one of the above provisions of the original Act remain in effect today, and represent, not only the original intent

of the law, but the continued thinking of Congress concerning its purposes and administration. These "intents and purposes" of the original Act were based on a memorial presented to Congress in 1878 by the American Association of Instructors of the Blind, which implied a moral contract to the effect that what was needed was a central, continuing source of supply of the special textbooks and other educational materials for blind children, that there was an institution with the buildings and facilities available to manufacture such materials, and that only a Federal grant could make possible such a continuing source of supply on an economical basis. It was not the original intent of the educators of that day, as represented by the AAIB, nor was it the understanding of the Congress, that this appropriation should be a subsidy to the states to provide materials which were available on the commercial market, or which should rightfully be a local responsibility. Let me say, however, that it is not a new idea to ask the Federal Government to put up money in order to make up for local deficiencies of financing. Not ten years after the passage of the Act of 1879, there was profound discussion on this point. On March 12, 1887, a ruling was handed down by the Comptroller of the Treasury, under which Governmental department the Act was then administered, which stated that such a diversion of the funds would be unlawful. Remember, at that time only residential schools for the blind were involved, not public school classes for the blind or integrated blind children in public schools. I point this out to you so that you will realize that the intent and purpose of the Act "To Promote the Education of the Blind" is not now, nor ever has been, to make up the difference in expenditures for the education of blind children at the state and local level from Federal monies. Its purpose then, and today, is to provide a central, economical, and *continuing* source of supply of the special materials needed in the education of the blind which cannot be obtained from commercial sources.

#### EARLY 1900'S

The first amendment to the Federal Act came in 1906, when the original trust fund was converted into a yearly appropriation, in perpetuity, of \$10,000, in lieu of interest on the original trust fund.

Shortly thereafter, two departmental rulings were handed down, which are important today. The first was made in November, 1906, by the Solicitor of the Department to the Secretary of the Treasury, which stated that state-supported adult training centers for the blind were to be construed as eligible as "public educational institutions for the blind," and, as such, to receive their proper apportionment of the materials provided by the Act. These institutions, as serving individuals of less than college grade, are still eligible today, but they must provide direct training of blind individuals through their own institutions, rather than through the vocational rehabilitation departments of state governments which pay for training wherever it is available for the purpose of the individual trainee.

The second ruling was even more basic. In January, 1912, the United States Solicitor ruled that the formally organized public day

school classes for the blind were to be considered as public institutions for the education of the blind, and, as such, should share in the free distribution of books and tangible apparatus as provided by the Act of 1879.

Both of the above rulings added new ex-officio Trustees to the Board of the Printing House, the first, the executive heads of the then rehabilitation centers, and the second, the superintendents of public schools providing organized day school classes for the blind. Today, only the executive heads of adult training centers which are eligible to register their trainees are members of the Ex-officio Board of Trustees, and the public schools educating blind children are now represented on the Ex-officio Board by the chief state school officers of their respective states. (For your information, less than 200 trainees are now, or ever have been, registered in any one year by adult training centers for the purposes of the Federal Act.)

#### ANNUAL APPROPRIATION

The first truly significant amendment to the basic Act was made in 1919 when, in addition to the \$10,000 permanent grant, an annual appropriation was provided. The ceiling of annual appropriation established at that time was \$40,000, which was subsequently enlarged in 1927 to \$65,000, in 1937 to \$115,000, in 1952 to \$250,000, and in 1956 to \$400,000. The recent legislation approved this past September eliminated entirely the ceiling of authorization.

#### TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT FROM TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939, and in accordance with the President's Reorganization Plan No. II, the administration of the annual appropriation to the American Printing House for the Blind, exclusive of the perpetual trust fund, was, by Joint Resolution of the Congress on June 7, 1939, transferred from the Treasury Department to the Security Agency (now the Department of Health, Education and Welfare), effective July 1, 1939.

#### OTHER IMPORTANT DEPARTMENTAL RULINGS

In May, 1936, the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury ruled that phonograph records (Talking Books) "are certainly means to promote the education of the blind, and are therefore within the scope of the Act of March 3, 1879."

Since passage of the original Act of 1879, the private schools for the blind have been construed as eligible to register their blind pupils for benefits under the Act by reason of the payment of tuition for their pupils by tax-supported state governments. This construction was reaffirmed by a ruling in 1941 by the Federal Security Agency of the eligibility of the Lavelle School for the Blind in New York (a private, parochial school for the blind) to receive quota allocations for their pupils since the school received tuition payments for these pupils from the State of New York.

In January, 1946, the General Counsel of the Federal Security Agency ruled that "large type books adapted for the education of the blind" came within the province of the Act. Additionally, in April, 1946, the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency ruled that the distribution of such materials should be limited to those children whose vision comes within the accepted definition of blindness of 20/200 or less, etc.

#### 1956 AND 1961 AMENDMENTS

On August 2, 1956, Congress made the first basic change in the authorizing Act by revising the wording of the law so as to specifically provide for blind children attending public schools, including those in organized day school classes for the blind as well as individual placements in regular public schools. The result of this legislation was to double in two years the total number of children registered, and by January, 1962, it is expected that there will be a total of 17,175 registrations as the basis of the quota allocations for the 1962-1963 fiscal year.

The most recent amendments to the basic Act, of course, is Public Law 294, adopted by Congress and approved by the President on September 22, 1961. This legislation accomplished the following four things:

1. As noted above, the elimination of the dollar-ceiling of authorization with respect to the annual appropriation, making possible the appropriation by Congress of such sums annually as can be demonstrated are needed for the provision of educational materials for the blind. As a result of the elimination of ceiling, and by means of a supplemental appropriation passed promptly before Congress adjourned, the appropriation for quota purposes for the current 1962 fiscal year has been increased to a total of \$649,000, based on a \$40-per-capita allotment for a total of 15,973 registrations.

2. The inclusion on the Ex-officio Trusteeship of the Printing House, for purposes of the Federal Act only, of not only the administrative heads of public educational institutions for the blind (or their designees), but also of the chief state school officers (or their designees), the latter of whom represent the blind children attending public schools for the seeing. This amendment corrected the inequity of the 1956 law which failed to make the chief state school officers members of the Printing House Board.

3. The provision for use by the Printing House of a reasonable sum of the annual appropriation each year for salaries and other expenses of experts and other staff to assist special committees which may be appointed in performance of their functions, and for expenses of such committees. Please note that no money is to be used for salaries of committee members, all of whom are Printing House Trustees. Instead, the money is to be used for payment of expenses of committee members to attend meetings, for the expansion of the administrative-editorial staff of the Printing House to more effectively administer the Act and to make possible the development and

expansion of better services and materials through the Act, and to pay for the advice and counsel of experts and people responsible for the education of blind children throughout the country in determining the materials to be supplied under the Act, etc. For the current 1962 fiscal year a total of \$41,000 has been appropriated for these purposes.

4. The inclusion of a definite statement in the basic law which makes it the responsibility of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prescribe rules and regulations necessary for the administration and interpretation of the law.

5. The reaffirmation of the original statement in the 1879 legislation which states that "No part of the appropriation shall be expended in the erection or leasing of buildings."

We at the Printing House are very pleased with the new Federal legislation, and the supplemental appropriation just received for the 1962 fiscal year. We know that the increased quotas will greatly help the schools and classes, and we shall do our best to keep up with orders. Further, the provision of separate money for use by the Printing House in administering the Act should make it possible for us to expand our services for the benefit of the schools and classes. It is our hope to add additional personnel to our editorial and administrative staffs for the purpose of not only providing better editorial services, but also to go into the field and consult and confer with the schools and state departments of education, as well as local public school systems. We shall also now be able to call on the services of experts in the field of education and others for information and guidance in developing new services as well as improving our present activities.

#### PRINTING HOUSE RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROBLEMS

The above gives a fairly detailed rundown on the basic provisions of the authorizing Act and subsequent amendments thereto, and also of departmental rulings which affect the administration of the Act. Additionally, I should like to point out to you some of the responsibilities delegated to the Printing House by this legislation, either by actual statement in the legislation or implied by the legislation.

##### 1. *Buildings and Facilities:*

As noted above, the Printing House has always been responsible for providing out of its own resources the buildings and facilities necessary to house the manufacture, administration, and storage of materials to be supplied through the Federal Act. For many years, this did not amount to a great deal, since the original building erected in 1878, and several additions to it up to the 1920's were supplied by the State of Kentucky, while in the 1930's and early 1940's small additions were made through APH funds. Records show that in 1944, the estimated book value of the original buildings, with additions, amounted to less than \$57,500, plus a land value (at original cost) of about \$12,000. Additionally, beginning in 1939, and continuing for

ten years thereafter, the Printing House had been renting manufacturing space in downtown Louisville for at least 50 per cent of its operations. Since 1949, however, extensive additions to the original facilities have been added, consisting of the manufacturing annex completed in that year at a cost of \$243,500, a warehouse in 1954 at a cost of \$77,500, a four-story office-and-administration building in 1955 which cost nearly \$231,000, and a new millroom warehouse, plus a two-story and basement storage and lunchroom wing, constructed in 1959 at a cost of approximately \$129,000. The total value of these constructions has amounted to nearly \$681,000, all of which was paid for out of funds donated to the Printing House. I am happy to report at this time that the Executive Committee two weeks ago approved another large building program for expanding the facilities of the plant and administration. The proposed expansion will include the addition of 30,960 square feet of gross floor area to the factory annex and storage and shipping areas, thereby also making possible the rearrangement and relief of crowded areas in the Braille embossing and proofreading departments and in the office and administration building. The contemplated cost of this new building program is \$300,000.

## *2. Increase in Production and Inventory:*

During the past fifteen years, the Printing House has increased its production in all departments many hundreds of times, the value of the products distributed last year amounting to \$1,711,870 — an increase of more than 420 per cent over the goods supplied in 1945. Additionally, and this is becoming increasingly important to the Printing House, the value of inventories has jumped from \$85,818.46 in 1945 to \$879,497.65 for the year ending last June 30th. The purpose of such inventories is, of course, to attempt to provide materials when called for by the schools and public school classes, even though we have no way of knowing in advance just which particular titles will be needed, and even though the total value of the Federal appropriation up to last June 30th amounted to only \$410,000 of our total business of \$1,711,870 for the same fiscal year. In other words, the Printing House has been willing to invest some \$879,000 of its capital funds in inventory in order to serve less than 24 per cent of its total value of business.

In closing, I want to explain that I have brought these facts to your attention at this time, so you may realize that the participation of the Printing House in the Federal Act "To Promote the Education of the Blind" is not a lucrative source of business, but poses very real responsibilities and requires very large financial commitments on the part of the institution, which commitments — at least inventory-wise — are not necessary for any of the work we undertake for our other customers.

Mr. Davis' paper was followed by questions which sought for clarification of various aspects of the American Printing House text book program. No specific recommendations were made.

★ ★ ★ ★

The Chairman invited Mr. Woolly to discuss the Quota System.

SURVEY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PRESENT QUOTA SYSTEM  
AND A CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

J. M. WOOLLY, *First Vice-President*

American Association of Instructors of the Blind

*Superintendent*, Arkansas School for the Blind

Differences of opinion have long existed among interested groups concerning the distribution of Federal funds appropriated to purchase educational materials for blind children.

The question of inequality or unfairness in distribution of such Federal funds (quota) arises from the fact that blind children educated at different geographical sites have different amounts of educational materials available for use. At one site one may find children studying with a complete array of Braille texts and educational aids, while at a second site children may be struggling with limited text materials and no educational aids. Several major factors and many minor factors appear responsible for this differential. Major factors are:

- a. Some states spend more per capita on education than do others. This, of course, means that funds of varying amounts are available to supplement quota funds and therefore more materials can be purchased for blind children. It should be pointed out that in many states great variability among communities may exist in this respect. The result is, however, that differences exist in the amounts of special materials that can be purchased for blind children.

The difference in per capita expenditures upon education among states and communities within states results primarily from differences in local emphasis on education and variations in the wealth of communities or states. Inequalities in educational resources arising from differences in local emphasis on education do not appear open to remedy through Federal means. However, inequalities in educational resources arising from differences in regional or state per capita income might in part be remedied through allocation of Federal support in part or in whole on the basis of such regional differences. However, it would seem that it would require the wisdom of Solomon to determine how this might be done.

- b. The needs of children for educational materials vary widely. Schools which provide only elementary education require far less expensive materials than do those enrolling high school students. Schools and classes for the retarded can make only limited use of books and aids. Rehabilitation units have special needs. An equitable method of distribution among pupils in the varied programs would be difficult, if not impossible, to establish.

- c. The efficiency of use of money spent on educational materials is directly related to the number of children educated at a given site. Where many children are educated at the same site, materials can be used several times, thereby reducing the per capita cost. Where only one child is educated at a site, the per capita cost of materials is maximum if such materials are not redistributed to other sites for additional use. The number of children educated at a given site appears largely determined by two factors:
1. Population density varies throughout the geographical regions of the United States. Therefore, within political divisions, the number of blind children to be educated will vary, and this variation will determine the efficiency of utilization of funds spent for educational materials. Equalization of the relative amounts of materials that could be purchased with quota funds at various sites could only be approached through adjusting the amounts allocated according to population density for specific geographical regions, which would be of great complexity and questionable accuracy.
  2. A second reason for variation in the number of children to be educated at a given site is that the people of the separate states elect to disperse the sites for education of blind children to varying degrees. In some states the people have chosen to group all or most blind children at a single site for the purpose of education. In other states, the people have chosen to educate blind children in their own communities, and the number of educational sites approaches the number of communities including blind children. Such dispersions or assembly of blind children is the free right of the people within states and communities. Communities which choose to disperse their children should not expect any additional allotment of Federal funds to offset the effects of this decision, but should recognize how difficult it would be to establish a fair rate of compensation, particularly since these dispersed groups are small and subject to large percentage fluctuations in size. Therefore, it would seem that variations in the quota made to counteract this factor should not be considered.

It might be helpful if we consider the organization and administration of educational programs for blind children throughout the United States. In some states, all or most blind children are educated in residential schools; in other states, all or most children are educated in the public schools; and in some states both types of education occur in varying relative amounts. Some states make little or no local provision for the education of blind children, but send their children to other states for the purpose. This, of course, means that one residential school may educate children from several states. Administration of educational programs within states is also heterogeneous. While

responsibility for public school education of blind children is usually that of the State Department of Education, in some states this responsibility lies with Commissions for the Blind.

For residential schools, the situation is more complex. While some residential schools are administered under the state education departments, these cases fall in the minority. Several schools are independent or semi-independent and are under the direction of autonomous boards of trustees. Others are under direct state control but are administered by State Boards of Control, Departments of Public Welfare, Departments of Health, Boards of Regents, Boards of Commissioners, Boards of Administration, Departments of Institutions and Youth Councils. In the past, quota funds have been allocated to appropriate state departments and residential schools on a per capita basis according to the number of blind children for which each was responsible.

The most serious criticisms of the existing system relate to the claimed inadequacy of available funds to supply the needs of individuals or small groups of blind children in a school system. However, such children are registered as part of a state-wide program. This system was deliberately established with the expectation that materials would be transferred as needed from school to school and would be available to all pupils in the state on the same basis as books in the residential school library are available to all children enrolled in that particular school.

## BREAKDOWN OF REGISTERING AGENCIES

### AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

	<i>Total Enrolled</i> 1960-61	
Number of agencies with 0-10 registered	13	31
Number of agencies with 11-25 registered	15	270
Number of agencies with 26-50 registered	15	536
Number of agencies with 51 or more registered	74	15,136
TOTAL	117	15,973
Average size of residential school units (63).		122.3
Average size of State units (54 including 4 zeros).		153.1
	1959/60 quota	1960/61 quota
Number of schools overdrawn 25%.	25	25
Number of State agencies overdrawn 25%.	10	14
Number of schools underspent 25%.	6	3
Number of State agencies underspent 25%.	9	5

Cash sales to Quota agencies approximately \$113,000.

The discussion which followed Mr. Woolly's paper gave evidence of a keen interest in studying alternatives (or supplements) to the existing system.

It was agreed that a resolution in favor of such study would be considered later in the meetings. (See page 24.)

★ ★ ★ ★

The Chairman presented Dr. Everett Wilcox to discuss a possible supplementary source of aids for blind children.

GRANTS IN AID TO STATES FOR SUPPLY OF EDUCATIONAL  
EQUIPMENT FOR USE BY BLIND CHILDREN

BY DR. EVERETT E. WILCOX, *Program Specialist in Education*  
American Foundation for the Blind

In view of the discussions that have provided much background for the problems and the discussions here today, I should like to focus our attention now to one of several major problems confronting those responsible for the education of blind children. Thanks to the efforts of the American Printing House for the Blind, the other braille presses and the volunteer braille transcribers, there are those who can now propose that a blind child need not be without a braille textbook in this country. But when we consider educational equipment, in some areas there is more to be desired. It might be well to remind the conferees here that we are considering a problem that may not exist in the established programs represented at this conference. We are to direct our attention then on a problem of the "have nots."

Let us briefly analyse the supply of the equipment provided through federal subsidy.

1. The supply under federal arrangement is very limited for several reasons.
  - a. the source of supply is limited to one agency.
  - b. in comparison with the rest of the market the number of items, some thirty in number, is a rather limited selection.
  - c. further, there are not volunteers to move into the breach to supplement the supply of the expensive apparatus nor are there any accelerated methods of production or reproduction in view.
2. The problem also exists because of the textbook competition for the quota dollar. Too many of the programs yet depend entirely upon quota allotment for all or most of their books and special equipment. If the small programs assign their quota allotments to the purchase of educational equipment, very little is available for braille books — not only for one year — but for several.
3. During the initiation of a program, cost for equipment is a major factor, although, equipment may have "long" life. On first analysis one might suppose this initial cost has

restricted the establishment of new programs. On the contrary, this is not so. The programs have been established with or without equipment and only the children have been without suitable educational tools.

We do not seem overly concerned of the stacks of braille and talking book material that go unused or have limited use in the curriculum centers and circulating libraries. If these materials are kept in inventory in readiness for the needs of the children, it would seem feasible that the special apparatus used day after day by children in their classrooms should be supplied.

To stimulate discussion, may I propose several approaches to the problem?

- A. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare provides matching federal grants to programs for the purchase of special equipment.
  1. the department provides federal grants for the emerging programs to underwrite the greater cost that comes during the initiation of a program. This proposal is for a grant to serve as an operating base so that children will have adequate educational tools during the important early years.
  2. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare provides federal grants for special equipment to the sub-standard, local or state program until basic requirements are met.
- B. Utilize the unused quota allotted to a program, local or state, to purchase equipment not available at the American Printing House for the Blind.
- C. Assign all unused quota allotments to a national fund that can be drawn upon to aid sub-standard programs. (We have depressed or emergency areas in this field as well as in general education.)

The experience and the talent is here at this conference. Let us then, in our immediate deliberations develop a plan that will provide the educational tools for blind children who may not always be enrolled in the large programs. Remember, in most instances, the children have had no choice as to where or how they are educated, but, they all need much the same types of special equipment and have a right to the educational tools required by most blind children.

Mr. Schloss suggested that the group present advise the House Subcommittee on Education that they support the provision of grants-in-aid for special equipment for exceptional children in all categories of handicap.

Mr. Stringham stated that in Congress the timetable for legislation on education had been disrupted, and this included special education.

He recognized that small approaches are sometimes effective, but usually are so slow in getting results that an omnibus approach may be needed. He suggested that recommendation for grants-in-aid should cover more than equipment, but also research, teacher-training, surveys and demonstration projects.

Dr. Romaine Mackie questioned the inclusion of research in view of existing programs.

★ ★ ★ ★

The Chairman reported that Mr. Burnham Carter, in accepting the invitation to attend these meetings, had requested a few minutes to report on the increasing demand for recorded material.

#### THE DEMAND FOR RECORDED TEXTBOOKS

MR. BURNHAM CARTER, *National Director*

Recording for the Blind, Inc.

The magnitude of the problem facing Recording for the Blind can be gauged from the fact that 1300 requests for recorded titles were received in September and October, 1961, an increase of 75 per cent over 1960. Two-thirds of these are text books. Formerly the program was mainly for college students, but now one-third of the text books are for children (half of these in Connecticut). Recording for the Blind is at peak production. and is having to seek aid, perhaps from the Federal Government.

★ ★ ★ ★

Mr. Robert S. Bray paid tribute to the volunteers who are doing so much to provide reading material to the blind, both in braille and on records. Eight of his staff of 32 are occupied in training volunteers, 600 of whom are graduated each year. He felt that volunteers can provide the only answer to Mr. Carter's problem and that no new legislation is needed.

★ ★ ★ ★

In introducing Dr. M. Robert Barnett, the Chairman mentioned that one bill introduced into Congress in 1961 included provision for an Advisory Council for the Federal Allotment to the American Printing House for the Blind. This was excluded from the bill finally enacted.

#### ADVISORY COUNCIL IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION

AND WELFARE ON EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS FOR THE BLIND

DR. M. ROBERT BARNETT, *Executive Director*

American Foundation for the Blind

Dr. Barnett spoke of the prevalence of advisory groups, both formal and informal, to act as checks on bureaucrats in U. S. governmental agencies. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, although not required to do so by law, has used an advisory council for years. Other programs involving money grants

on matching basis (e.g. the Hill-Burton Act and the act dealing with the seven Institutes of Health) make use of an advisory council. The field of special education was without experience with legalised advisory councils until the program supporting the training of teachers of the deaf was enacted a few weeks ago.

"To me the American Printing House board of one hundred seems unwieldy though Mr. Davis thinks otherwise, feeling that the values in public education outweigh the disadvantage of size. The APH program may be wider in scope in the future than at present, and this suggests that an advisory council might be helpful. The Fogarty Bill introduced into the last Congress included an Advisory Council of twelve with the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare or the Superintendent of the American Printing House as presiding officer. Provision was made for rotation in office, staggered terms, and for travel expenses and per diem allowances. Suggested composition of the Council was four administrators, four teachers and four others competent to serve."

★            ★            ★            ★

The Chairman introduced Miss Eisnaugle, who had been invited to present her topic because of interesting developments in Ohio.

DESIRABILITY OF DESIGNATING A STATE AGENCY OR AGENCIES AT STATE  
LEVEL FOR DISTRIBUTION OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS FOR THE BLIND

MISS EVELYN EISNAUGLE

Division of Special Education, Ohio

Under P. L. 531 a grant has been approved to investigate ways of setting up a central agency in Ohio for handling special books and materials used by blind children in all programs in the State.

The problems of distribution have been discussed in other meetings, notably two in Louisville, Kentucky, under the joint auspices of the American Printing House and the American Foundation for the Blind. The Reports of these meetings and the pamphlet, "Guidelines," published by the Foundation formed the basis of our thinking.

We plan a central repository at the Ohio State School for the Blind, with school and State working together and planning a budget.

We feel that the program we propose has many advantages, such as

— the establishment of an official status for the program which we expect will be headed by someone who will bear the title of "coordinator"

— strengthening the already good relationship between the school and the state

— providing for continuing evaluation of all materials with regard to both suitability and physical condition

— acquainting all concerned with new books and equipment through the use of a newsletter

— being helpful to national agencies

— eliminating waste and duplication

— establishing a pattern for other states.

We expect the coordinator will go into communities to consult and advise. It was expected that the coordinator would be an experienced educator. Extra personnel for the project might include a full-time secretary and some part-time workers.

The discussion which followed Miss Eisnaugle's paper indicated that programs of this nature might be suitable for support by grants-in-aid to the states by the Federal Government.



The Chairman welcomed Miss Josephine Taylor, while regretting the unfortunate automobile accident which had prevented Mr. George Meyer, the Executive Director of the New Jersey Commission for the Blind, from being present.

OWNERSHIP OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS FOR THE BLIND  
PROVIDED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT  
MISS JOSEPHINE L. TAYLOR, *Director of Educational Services*  
New Jersey State Commission for the Blind

When Dr. Waterhouse wrote to Mr. Meyer asking him to handle the topic of Ownership of Educational Materials for the Blind Provided by the Federal Government, he stated, "In our own experience there does not seem to be any complication involved in ownership; nevertheless, it is a topic about which inquiries are being made, particularly by State Departments of Education whose introduction into this program is relatively new."

I think Dr. Waterhouse has stated the problem succinctly. This would not present a problem to the superintendents of institutions for the education of the blind. However, with the 1956 amendment to the act to promote the education of the blind, the chief state school officers were not only presented with the opportunity to obtain quota allocation for all of the blind children attending public schools in their states, but also with certain administrative problems. One of these has been the reaction of certain local school districts that previously obtained a quota directly and could thereby order materials directly and considered these materials their property. Apparently, some of these local school districts, especially those with a relatively high enrollment of blind children, have resented their enforced joining of a cooperative.

The advantages which can accrue from this cooperative purchase and distribution have been well outlined by Miss Eisnaugle and have been experienced to a degree by some of us here today.

It would seem that "inquiries are being made" because there has not been adequate interpretation to state departments of education and those school districts that previously received a quota of their own.

Actually there would seem to be no reason why the chief state school officer cannot transfer the ownership of the books and materials to local districts if this is deemed wise — as it might be in the case of certain basic equipment. It would seem wiser, however, to place this as a permanent-loan basis making the borrower responsible for keeping this public property in

condition so that it is available for use where needed. The same would be true of text books and might be advisable in certain situations.

From our experience it is evident that most local districts are glad to relieve their shelves of the extra second or fourth grade textbooks to make room for the ninth or third grade books they really want this year.

Regarding legislative proposals — which is the written statement of purpose for this conference — in letters from the A.A.I.B. and A.F.B. — it would seem that the ownership of books and other materials is implied in the current law since it is in these that the superintendent of the school for the blind or the chief state school officer receives that portion of the appropriation allocated according to the number of pupils registered by him. If this remains a serious problem, it could, of course, be spelled out in future legislation.

The basic problem in *this* subject does not appear to be a need for new legislation, but rather an interpretation of the present law and better organizations for cooperative purchase, use and distribution of the books and materials provided by the law.

★                      ★                      ★                      ★

Dr. William Geer, Executive Secretary of the Council for Exceptional Children, presented his topic from the notes printed below.

GRANTS IN AID TO STATES FOR EDUCATION AND CARE OF  
MULTIPLY-HANDICAPPED BLIND

DR. WILLIAM GEER, *Executive Secretary*  
Council for Exceptional Children

1. Why CEC is interested in the visually handicapped? 5.4% or approximately 750 of our members gave the visually handicapped as their field. Of these, more than half are members of AAIB if the sample runs true to the entire membership. (Sample, 6,841)
2. What services are needed for the multiply-handicapped blind?
  - a. Deaf-blind, blind-mentally retarded, blind-cerebral-palsied.
  - b. Would the agency administering appropriate services be any different from the one doing the same for other multiply-handicapped? E.g., deaf, mentally retarded, cerebral palsied and others.
3. The CEC legislative program could provide a convenient framework for educational services for all exceptional children. Properly enacted, it would also provide a basis for action with reference to multiply-handicapped children with various combinations of conditions.

CEC'S PROGRAM FOR FEDERAL LEGISLATION

The CEC has long advocated a comprehensive and large scale approach to the national unmet needs of Special Education in this country. After careful study and discussions over several years by many leaders representing all the exceptionality groups, a three-fold

program was formulated and formally adopted by the Board of Governors and Delegate Assembly of CEC at Detroit in April of 1961. It includes: (1) scholarships and fellowship grants for the preparation of educational personnel in all areas of Special Education; (2) grants-in-aid to states to stimulate the improvement and initiation of special education services; (3) a designated special education research program in the Office of Education to attack and solve the educational problems of handicapped and gifted children.

### CEC'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The term "exceptional children and youth" means those children determined in accordance with regulations issued by the Commissioner of Education to present special educational problems, such as (a) children who are unusually intelligent or gifted; (b) children who are mentally retarded; (c) children who are deaf or hard of hearing; (d) children who are blind or have serious visual impairments; (e) children who have serious health problems due to heart disease, epilepsy, or other debilitating conditions; (f) children who suffer from speech impediments; (g) children who are crippled (including those who have cerebral palsy or are neurologically impaired); (h) children who are maladjusted emotionally and socially, including the institutionalized delinquent; and (i) combinations of the above.

#### A. *Scholarships and Fellowships*

##### 1. *College and university grants*

Grants to public and private non-profit colleges and university programs, carefully selected and approved by the Commissioner of Education, for awarding of scholarships and fellowships at undergraduate and graduate levels for those intending to become teachers, administrators, supervisors and teacher educators in the field of the education of exceptional children (the handicapped and the gifted). These will include support grants to cover the cost of the program to the institution the student attends.

##### 2. *Expansion grants*

Substantial grants to carefully selected public and private non-profit institutions of higher education for new or expanded programs for the preparation of professional personnel in the education of exceptional children. The program should be based on several exceptionalities and may include complimentary research and demonstration grants. Commitments for governmental support should extend from a three to five year period.

#### B. *Grants-in-Aid to States*

##### 1. *Basic services grants*

Federal support should provide grants on a matching basis for the purpose of assisting states to educate exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted), so that they may develop to the extent of their capacities.

These grants are for the purpose of providing basic educational services to all exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted) through a state plan approved by the U. S. Commissioner of Education. Such a plan should provide for an administrative head directly responsible to the state educational board of control or the chief state school executive officer. This plan for pre-approval must provide the major financial participation by the state; show the plan, policies and methods of carrying out this program within the state department of education (instruction); indicate methods of administration, personnel standards, minimum standards for facilities, equipment and services; and provide for cooperation with the local, state and federal agencies engaged in the education of exceptional children (the handicapped and the gifted).

2. *Extension and improvement of service*

Local school districts should be eligible for federal incentive grants which will encourage the improvement and extension of special education services to exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted) through their state education agencies. Similar grants to public and private non-profit agencies and institutions may also be made for approved projects which meet professionally established criteria and which will contribute to a significant degree to the improvement and extension of basic services.

3. *Staff support grants (technical assistance grants)*

For the employment of consultants and the securing of highly qualified staff personnel, federal stimulation grants should be made to state departments of education for the supplementing of local and state funds for salary and consultative purposes on a short-term basis.

4. *Improvement of state services*

For the improvement of state services, fellowships shall be available through state departments of education for graduate training of supervisors and administrators in public and other non-profit programs of special education. These may also include in-service training grants for institutes, summer programs and other programs designed to upgrade services to handicapped and gifted children.

C. *Research Grants: Demonstration and Special Projects Grants*

1. *Research and demonstration grants*

A federal grant program should be initiated to states and public and private non-profit organizations and agencies to provide for research grants and demonstration projects in the education of exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted). These shall include research, demonstration, training and special facility services and other special service grants which hold promise of making a sub-

stantial contribution to the solution of special education problems common to all or several states.

2. *Research centers*

Provision for research grants with the objective of developing permanent interest in basic and applied research on problems of exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted) may be made to regional centers established by public and private non-profit organizations and agencies approved by the Commissioner of Education and the National Research Council on Special Education.

3. *National Research Council on Special Education*

There should be established a National Research Advisory Council on Special Education in the Office of Education to review applications or initiate significant studies and to recommend to the Commissioner of Education any project which holds promise of progress in special education services, knowledge or activities. This council of 12 members shall represent the major groups of educators of exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted).

See Appendix page 31.

Mr. Geer concluded his presentation with an appeal for solidarity among our organizations. He felt that we should no longer be content with minimum token programs but should make it clear to Federal agencies that we were ready to support larger scale programs. He recognized that many of our existing frustrations are caused by lack of personnel (e.g. in research) and funds to provide services we could otherwise offer now.

Mr. Marchisio asked about the feasibility of securing federal funds for building centers.

Mr. Geer felt that we could not do everything at once because of lack of personnel and that we should first seek 1) enabling legislation, 2) funds to get programs under way.

Mr. O'Keefe asked if the Children's Bureau, etc., were helping to initiate legislation.

Dr. Mackie stated that all major groups in H. E. W. are interested. There are some coordinating committees and temporary task forces functioning. Studies are always in progress.

Mr. Whitten said that the National Rehabilitation Association is interested in what is being known as "independent" living legislation. He feels it is very important to have cooperation between education and rehabilitation workers in proposing legislation.

Dr. Barnett asked if the C. E. C. would seek to have legislation introduced or wait for sub-committee initiation.

Mr. Geer replied, "perhaps both," but no decision has yet been made.

★ ★ ★ ★

The Chairman apologized for the absence of Allan W. Sherman, who was prevented at the last moment from being present to discuss "What are the Ramifications of Participation by Private and Parochial Schools in the Federal Program Supplying Educational Materials to the Blind."

The question was thrown open to discussion.

Several speakers, including Miss Kay Gruber of the American Foundation for the Blind, felt that a number of blind children in private and parochial schools were being deprived of the services of the American Printing House for the Blind. No figures of the numbers involved were available.

A number of speakers felt that there was grave risk of endangering proposed legislation if the issue of the private and parochial schools were involved, citing the fate of the Aid to Education Bill in the last session of Congress.

★            ★            ★            ★

Discussion was then directed to specific courses of action.

A vote was passed unanimously requesting the A. A. I. B. to seek the assistance of the Secretary of the Health, Education and Welfare Department in setting up a study of the quota system.

(Note: As a result of this vote, Miss Lois V. Cox, as President of the A. A. I. B., directed the following letter to Secretary Ribicoff.)

December 9, 1961

MR. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, *Secretary*  
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare  
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Ribicoff:

On November 1 and 2, 1961, the American Association of Instructors of the Blind, acting with the cooperation of the American Foundation for the Blind, held a conference at the Dodge House, Washington, D. C., on Distribution of Textbooks and Educational Aids for Blind Children.

Thirty-six persons were present, including representatives of the following agencies and organizations:

- United States Office of Education
- American Association of Instructors of the Blind
- American Foundation for the Blind
- American Association of Workers for the Blind
- National Federation of the Blind
- National Society for the Prevention of Blindness
- American Printing House for the Blind
- Blinded Veterans Association
- National Recordings for the Blind
- National Rehabilitation Association
- Council for Exceptional Children
- Library of Congress

The Office of Education was represented by Dr. Romaine P. Mackie, Chief, Exceptional Children and Youth; Mr. Luther Stringham, Director of Office of Program Analysis; and Mr. John W. Jones, Consultant on the Visually Handicapped.

Among the various topics discussed was the present Quota System by which Federal funds are distributed through the American Printing House for the Blind in Louisville, Kentucky, under the Act of March 3, 1879, to promote the education of the blind. While various suggestions were made, it was recognized that a more complete study was required than was possible during a two-day session. As a result the participants voted unanimously to request me, as President of the American Association of Instructors of the Blind, to petition you to organize a study in consultation with the American Printing House for the Blind, and other interested agencies, into possible alternatives to the above System.

I trust that you will find it possible to accede to this request and wish to assure you of the fullest cooperation of the American Association of Instructors of the Blind.

Respectfully yours,

LOIS V. COX, *President*  
A.A.I.B.

LVC/beh

It was also VOTED unanimously that the A. A. I. B. appoint a committee to prepare a position paper on needed legislation dealing with the education of the blind, reflecting the expressed viewpoints of those attending this conference, which should be presented to all interested agencies and organizations for concurrence and for assistance in preparing specific proposals for submission to Congress.

In accord with this vote Miss Lois Cox appointed the following committee to meet in Columbus, Ohio, December 13 and 14, 1961:

MISS EVELYN EISNAUGLE

Division of Special Education  
State Department of Education  
Columbus, Ohio

DR. EVERETT WILCOX

Program Specialist in Education  
American Foundation for the Blind, Inc.  
New York, New York

DR. EDWARD J. WATERHOUSE

Perkins School for the Blind  
Watertown 72, Massachusetts

MR. J. M. WOOLLY

Arkansas School for the Blind  
Little Rock, Arkansas

MISS JOSEPHINE TAYLOR

New Jersey State Commission for the Blind  
Newark 2, New Jersey

MR. LEE A. IVERSON

Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School  
Vinton, Iowa

Dr. Waterhouse was unable to attend. Mr. Maurice Olsen, American Association of Instructors of the Blind, Mr. D. W. Overbeay, Ohio State School for the Blind, and Mr. R. A. Horn, State of Ohio, Division of Special Education, were invited to attend as special observers.

The statement prepared by the committee is as follows:

POSITION PAPER ON NEEDED LEGISLATION CONCERNING THE  
EDUCATION OF VISUALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

I. We agree with and support the principles embodied in the Council for Exceptional Children's legislative program, which seeks to provide a comprehensive program for exceptional children, including those who are visually handicapped.

II. We believe it imperative that any Federal programs for the education and welfare of children shall be made available to all visually handicapped children enrolled in any public school or educational institution.

III. It is our belief that there should be established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on the Education of Visually Handicapped Children. We believe such a Committee should be comprised of representatives of residential schools, State Departments of Education, local school districts, and those national agencies, organizations and associations actively concerned with the education and welfare of visually handicapped children and youth. This committee shall advise and make recommendations to the Commissioner of Education and to any other governmental agency, committee or council on such matters as research, grants-in-aid to colleges and universities, demonstration grants and any other aspect of the education, training and welfare of visually handicapped children.

IV. We believe there is need for additional on-going Federal support for the education of visually handicapped children through annual appropriations to provide for purchase, distribution and maintenance of adequate special materials and equipment not available through other Federal programs.

V. We believe that if categorical legislation is necessary, the following adaptation of the Council for Exceptional Children's legislative program should be pursued.

A. *Grants-in-Aid to States*

1. *Basic services grants*

Federal support should provide grants on a matching basis for the purpose of assisting states to educate visually handi-

capped children and youth, so that they may develop to the extent of their capacities. These grants are for the purpose of providing basic educational services to all visually handicapped children and youth through a state plan approved by the U. S. Commissioner of Education. Such a plan should provide for an administrative head directly responsible to the state educational board of control or the chief state school executive officer. This plan for pre-approval must provide the major financial participation by the state; show the plan, policies and methods of carrying out this program within the state department of education (instruction); indicate methods of administration, personnel standards, minimum standards for facilities, equipment and services; and provide for cooperation with the local, state and federal agencies engaged in the education of visually handicapped children.

2. *Extension and improvement of service*

Local school districts should be eligible for federal incentive grants which will encourage the improvement and extension of special education services to visually handicapped children and youth through their state education agencies. Similar grants to public and private non-profit agencies and institutions may also be made for approved projects which meet professionally established criteria and which will contribute to a significant degree to the improvement and extension of basic services.

3. *Staff support grants (technical assistance grants)*

For the employment of consultants and the securing of highly qualified staff personnel, federal stimulation grants should be made to state departments of education for the supplementing of local and state funds for salary and consultative purposes on a short-term basis.

4. *Improvement of state services*

For the improvement of state services, fellowships shall be available through state departments of education for graduate training of supervisors and administrators in public and other non-profit programs for visually handicapped children. These may also include in-service training grants for institutes, summer programs and other programs designed to upgrade services to visually handicapped children.

B. *Scholarships and Fellowships*

1. *College and university grants*

Grants to public and private non-profit colleges and university programs, carefully selected and approved by the Commissioner of Education, for awarding of scholarships and fellowships at under-graduate and graduate levels for those intending to become teachers, administrators and teacher educators in the field of the education of visually handicapped children.

These will include grants to cover the cost of the program to the institution the student attends.

2. *Expansion grants*

Substantial grants to carefully selected public and private non-profit institutions of higher education for new or expanded programs for the preparation of professional personnel in the education of visually handicapped children. The program should be based on several exceptionalities and may include complimentary research and demonstration grants. Commitments for governmental support should extend from a three to five year period.

C. *Research Grants: Demonstration and Special Projects Grants*

1. *Research and demonstration grants*

A federal grant program should be initiated to states and public and private non-profit organizations and agencies to provide for research grants and demonstration projects in the education of visually handicapped children and youth. These shall include research, demonstration, training and special facility services and other special service grants which hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the solution of educational problems of visually handicapped children, common to all or several states.

2. *Research centers*

Provision for research grants with the objective of developing permanent interest in basic and applied research on problems of visually handicapped children and youth may be made to regional centers established by public and private non-profit organizations and agencies approved by the Commissioner of Education and the National Research Council on Special Education.

D. *National Advisory Committee on Education of Visually Handicapped Children*

There should be established a National Advisory Committee on the Education of visually handicapped children in the Office of Education to review applications or initiate significant studies and to recommend to the Commissioner of Education any project which holds promise of progress in services, knowledge or activities. This Committee of 12 members shall represent the major groups of educators of visually handicapped children and youth.

VI. We re-affirm our belief that the most necessary and desirable approach should be with comprehensive legislation, but we believe that if only piecemeal legislation is possible, the following order of priorities should be considered:

1. Grants-in-Aid to States
2. Scholarships and Fellowships

3. Research Grants: demonstration and special project grants
4. Advisory Committee

Respectfully submitted,

Special Position Paper Committee  
 EVELYN EISNAUGLE, *Chairman*  
 JOSEPHINE TAYLOR  
 J. M. WOOLLY

*Ex-Officio*  
 MR. R. A. HORN  
 D. W. OVERBEAY  
 MAURICE OLSEN

## APPENDIX

### CEC'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(As presented in

*A Statement to the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, by William C. Geer, Executive Secretary of the Council for Exceptional Children, a Department of the National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., August 23, 1961)*

The term "exceptional children and youth" means those children determined in accordance with regulations issued by the Commissioner of Education to present special educational problems, such as (a) children who are unusually intelligent or gifted; (b) children who are mentally retarded; (c) children who are deaf or hard of hearing; (d) children who are blind or have serious visual impairments; (e) children who have serious health problems due to heart disease, epilepsy, or other debilitating conditions; (f) children who suffer from speech impediments; (g) children who are crippled (including those who have cerebral palsy or are neurologically impaired); (h) children who are maladjusted emotionally and socially, including the institutionalized delinquent; and (i) combinations of the above.

#### A. *Scholarships and Fellowships*

##### 1. *College and university grants*

Grants to public and private non-profit colleges and university programs, carefully selected and approved by the Commissioner of Education, for awarding of scholarships and fellowships at under-graduate and graduate levels for those intending to become teachers, administrators, supervisors and teacher educators in the field of the education of exceptional children (the handicapped and the gifted). These will include support grants to cover the cost of the program to the institution the student attends.

##### 2. *Expansion grants*

Substantial grants to carefully selected public and private non-profit institutions of higher education for new or expanded programs for the preparation of professional personnel in the education of exceptional children. The program

should be based on several exceptionalities and may include complimentary research and demonstration grants. Commitments for governmental support should extend from a three to five year period.

B. *Grants-in-Aid to States*

1. *Basic services grants*

Federal support should provide grants on a matching basis for the purpose of assisting states to educate exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted), so that they may develop to the extent of their capacities. These grants are for the purpose of providing basic educational services to all exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted) through a state plan approved by the U. S. Commissioner of Education. Such a plan should provide for an administrative head directly responsible to the state educational board of control or the chief state school executive officer. This plan for pre-approval must provide the major financial participation by the state; show the plan, policies and methods of carrying out this program within the state department of education (instruction); indicate methods of administration, personnel standards, minimum standards for facilities, equipment and services; and provide for co-operation with the local, state and federal agencies engaged in the education of exceptional children (the handicapped and the gifted).

2. *Extension and improvement of service*

Local school districts should be eligible for federal incentive grants which will encourage the improvement and extension of special education services to exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted) through their state education agencies. Similar grants to public and private non-profit agencies and institutions may also be made for approved projects which meet professionally established criteria and which will contribute to a significant degree to the improvement and extension of basic services.

3. *Staff support grants (technical assistance grants)*

For the employment of consultants and the securing of highly qualified staff personnel, federal stimulation grants should be made to state departments of education for the supplementing of local and state funds for salary and consultative purposes on a short-term basis.

4. *Improvement of state services*

For the improvement of state services, fellowships shall be available through state departments of education for graduate training of supervisors and administrators in public and other non-profit programs of special education. These may also include in-service training grants for institutes, summer programs and other programs designed to upgrade services to handicapped and gifted children.

### C. *Research Grants: Demonstration and Special Projects Grants*

#### 1. *Research and demonstration grants*

A federal grant program should be initiated to states and public and private non-profit organizations and agencies to provide for research grants and demonstration projects in the education of exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted). These shall include research, demonstration, training and special facility services and other special service grants which hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the solution of special education problems common to all or several states.

#### 2. *Research centers*

Provision for research grants with the objective of developing permanent interest in basic and applied research on problems of exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted) may be made to regional centers established by public and private non-profit organizations and agencies approved by the Commissioner of Education and the National Research Council on Special Education.

#### 3. *National Research Council on Special Education*

There should be established a National Research Advisory Council on Special Education in the Office of Education to review applications or initiate significant studies and to recommend to the Commissioner of Education any project which holds promise of progress in special education services, knowledge or activities. This council of 12 members shall represent the major groups of educators of exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted).

★            ★            ★            ★

*A Statement to the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, by William C. Geer, Executive Secretary of the Council for Exceptional Children, a Department of the National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., August 23, 1961*

The Council for Exceptional Children is the largest and only group of special educators and community members organized in the United States to improve educational programs for exceptional children, both handicapped and gifted. Over 14,000 members from the 50 states of the Union belong to the Council which is organized through 38 state branches and federations and 293 local chapters. Our membership is comprised of administrators and supervisors of special education programs, college and university professors, state education department personnel, researchers and teachers with smaller numbers of social workers, psychologists and other specialized personnel.

CEC members may be found in special classes and special schools, in cities and rural areas, in universities and clinics, in homes and hospitals—anywhere that handicapped and gifted children are being educated in any location that therapy or training is being given. In all of these settings you

will find special educators instructing exceptional children and assuring their parents and other community members that these atypical children need and deserve the best education that their ability allows.

The Council for Exceptional Children, or CEC, is interested in and encompasses all groups of the handicapped and gifted. The blind and the partially sighted, the deaf and the hard of hearing, the crippled, the speech handicapped, the cerebral palsied, the brain injured, the epileptic, the mentally retarded, the gifted, the neurologically impaired, the socially maladjusted and the emotionally disturbed — no matter what their special problems — all must be educated and special educators are needed for this task of providing the best educational programs possible.

Since 1956, the CEC has been actively campaigning nationally to alleviate the single most important problem in the field of Special Education. This is the shortage of personnel — of teachers, of administrators, of supervisors, of researchers, of college and university instructors. During the 85th Congress, the first small beginning was made at the Federal level with the passage of Public Law 85-926 to provide in the Office of Education a scholarship and fellowship program for educational personnel in the area of the mentally retarded. For the past two years, a million dollars annually has been provided for graduate study at colleges and universities for administrators, supervisors, state department personnel and teacher educators in the field of the mentally retarded. No money has been available for the training of teachers although the law authorizes this step.

During 1959 and 1960 the national study of special education and rehabilitation, initiated by Congressman Graham Barden, Chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor, absorbed the energies of Congress and professionals alike so that Federal legislation was delayed while data and testimony were gathered. Thus, the members of the 87th Congress have available to them seven volumes of testimony given by special education and rehabilitation specialists from all over the country, attesting to the tremendous needs and gaps in Federal services for handicapped and gifted people.

Regional hearings were held in New Haven, Connecticut for the New England states; in New York City for the New York and surrounding area; in Jersey City, New Jersey, for the Middle Atlantic states; in Cullman, Alabama, for the South; in Chicago for the Midwest; in San Francisco for California and the Southwest; and in Portland, Oregon, for the Northwest. Most of these regional hearings were preceded by 2 or 3 day conferences of professional educators and rehabilitation leaders who freely gave of their time and services to present through designated spokesmen the tremendous unmet needs in Special Education and Rehabilitation services that could be met by Federal assistance. In New York City, for example, over 150 outstanding national professional leaders met for two days and developed some of the testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Special Education, chaired by Congressman Carl Elliott.

Several major conclusions are inescapable in the wealth of information and data printed in these seven volumes.

1. About 25 percent of the Nation's handicapped and gifted children are currently receiving the special education services they need, deserve and

could receive. This has been attested to again and again by surveys in various states, among various exceptionality groups and in large areas of the United States. For example, the survey of 13 western states completed in 1960 by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education indicates a need for 13,000 more special teachers and concludes that less than half of the presently employed teachers and supervisors are fully certified for their particular specialty.

2. All areas of handicapping conditions and special education are desperate for personnel. Each group suffers because of a lack of trained teachers and educational leaders with advanced degrees and each group thinks of his or her exceptionality as being the most important. Since CEC does not believe that the handicapping conditions which affect the smallest numbers of children are any less deserving than the larger groups, the CEC position has always been plainly stated that Federal assistance to Special Education programs is needed for all physical, emotional, and mentally handicapping conditions. Teachers and administrators, college and university personnel and researchers can and should be aided by Federal incentive grants to enter the Special Education field of their choice and to teach and administer after successfully completing the proper preparation program.

3. The Federal government has a unique supporting and incentive role to play in the education of exceptional children. In some exceptionality groups, the numbers of teachers needed are too small for each state to set up training programs in local colleges or state universities. In these cases, for example, the training of teachers of the blind or deaf, regional centers could supply surrounding states in the most economical manner. These universities have already been designated in some parts of our country by the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education and the Southern Regional Education Board. For all handicapping conditions, however, the Federal government's incentive role is essential. By directing attention to the areas of special education and by providing partial support through scholarships, fellowships, research grants, demonstration projects and grants-in-aid to states, a period of growth and rapid expansion can be assured for all exceptional children.

4. The unique needs of handicapping conditions have always been acknowledged by the Federal government. Precedents have been set by Federal laws passed to establish special programs for the blind, such as the American Printing House for the Blind or the Talking Book program of the Library of Congress; for the deaf, such as Gallaudet College or the Captioned Film Program in the Office of Education; for the mentally retarded, such as Public Law 85-926, giving scholarships through the Office of Education; for speech and hearing, through fellowships in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and for many other special education groups. On the overall picture of handicapping conditions, an entire office of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, that of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, has been set up to train and aid the handicapped adults through research, demonstrations, direct aid to states and scholarships for personnel. The Federal government provides the same broad services for handicapped people on the medical side through the Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health. Only in the education field does the Federal government make almost no attempt to help prepare several handicapped groups of children for complete education and fully developed lives.

## CEC'S PROGRAM FOR FEDERAL LEGISLATION

The CEC has long advocated a comprehensive and large scale approach to the national unmet needs of Special Education in this country. After careful study and discussions over several years by many leaders representing all the exceptionality groups, a three-fold program was formulated and formally adopted by the Board of Governors and Delegate Assembly of CEC at Detroit in April of 1961. It includes: (1) scholarships and fellowship grants for the preparation of educational personnel in all areas of Special Education; (2) grants-in-aid to states to stimulate the improvement and initiation of special education services; (3) a designated special education research program in the Office of Education to attack and solve the educational problems of handicapped and gifted children.

### CEC'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The term "exceptional children and youth" means those children determined in accordance with regulations issued by the Commissioner of Education to present special educational problems, such as (a) children who are unusually intelligent or gifted; (b) children who are mentally retarded; (c) children who are deaf or hard of hearing; (d) children who are blind or have serious visual impairments; (e) children who have serious health problems due to heart disease, epilepsy, or other debilitating conditions; (f) children who suffer from speech impediments; (g) children who are crippled (including those who have cerebral palsy or are neurologically impaired); (h) children who are maladjusted emotionally and socially, including the institutionalized delinquent; and (i) combinations of the above.

#### A. *Scholarships and Fellowships*

##### 1. *College and university grants*

Grants to public and private non-profit colleges and university programs, carefully selected and approved by the Commissioner of Education, for awarding of scholarships and fellowships at undergraduate and graduate levels for those intending to become teachers, administrators, supervisors and teacher educators in the field of the education of exceptional children (the handicapped and the gifted). These will include support grants to cover the cost of the program to the institution the student attends.

##### 2. *Expansion grants*

Substantial grants to carefully selected public and private non-profit institutions of higher education for new or expanded programs for the preparation of professional personnel in the education of exceptional children. The program should be based on several exceptionalities and may include complementary research and demonstration grants. Commitments for governmental support should extend from a three to five year period.

#### B. *Grants-in-Aid to States*

##### 1. *Basic services grants*

Federal support should provide grants on a matching basis for the purpose of assisting states to educate exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted), so that they may develop to the extent of their capacities. These grants are for the purpose of providing basic educational

services to all exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted) through a state plan approved by the U. S. Commissioner of Education. Such a plan should provide for an administrative head directly responsible to the state educational board of control or the chief state school executive officer. This plan for pre-approval must provide the major financial participation by the state; show the plan, policies and methods of carrying out this program within the state department of education (instruction); indicate methods of administration, personnel standards, minimum standards for facilities, equipment and services; and provide for cooperation with the local, state and federal agencies engaged in the education of exceptional children (the handicapped and the gifted).

2. *Extension and improvement of service*

Local school districts should be eligible for federal incentive grants which will encourage the improvement and extension of special education services to exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted) through their state education agencies. Similar grants to public and private non-profit agencies and institutions may also be made for approved projects which meet professionally established criteria and which will contribute to a significant degree to the improvement and extension of basic services.

3. *Staff support grants (technical assistance grants)*

For the employment of consultants and the securing of highly qualified staff personnel, federal stimulation grants should be made to state departments of education for the supplementing of local and state funds for salary and consultative purposes on a short-term basis.

4. *Improvement of state services*

For the improvement of state services, fellowships shall be available through state departments of education for graduate training of supervisors and administrators in public and other non-profit programs of special education. These may also include in-service training grants for institutes, summer programs and other programs designed to upgrade services to handicapped and gifted children.

C. *Research Grants: Demonstration and Special Projects Grants*

1. *Research and demonstration grants*

A federal grant program should be initiated to states and public and private non-profit organizations and agencies to provide for research grants and demonstration projects in the education of exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted). These shall include research, demonstration, training and special facility services and other special service grants which hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the solution of special education problems common to all or several states.

2. *Research centers*

Provision for research grants with the objective of developing permanent interest in basic and applied research on problems of exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted) may be made to regional centers established by public and private non-profit organizations and agencies approved by the Commissioner of Education and the National Research Council on Special Education.

### 3. *National Research Council on Special Education*

There should be established a National Research Advisory Council on Special Education in the Office of Education to review applications or initiate significant studies and to recommend to the Commissioner of Education any project which holds promise of progress in special education services, knowledge or activities. This council of 12 members shall represent the major groups of educators of exceptional children and youth (the handicapped and the gifted).

Presently before the Subcommittee are several proposals dealing with various aspects of the total national needs in Special Education. CEC is convinced that HR 7175 for the expansion of Public Law 85-926 to include all areas of handicapped children would help to insure a satisfactory solution to this one area of Special Education need. Even more satisfactory would be a comprehensive Special Education Bill including scholarships and fellowships, the grants-in-aid program and a special education research program. As far as S 336 is concerned, the provisions of Title I providing scholarships for teachers of the deaf and Title II for speech correctionists and audiologists could be assimilated in a comprehensive Special Education proposal. Both the area of the deaf and that of speech and hearing are in need of trained personnel at all levels — teachers, administrators, supervisors, researchers, college and university instructors — and the CEC joins in urging the Congress to provide assistance and alleviation of their difficulties as well as those of the other physically, emotionally and mentally handicapped groups in the Special Education field.

The CEC also urges the Subcommittee's favorable action upon bills in the area of juvenile delinquency and the blind (HR 365 and HR 8212, among others). As has been explained by other witnesses at greater length, the American Printing House for the Blind is in need of an increased appropriation to meet the expanding enrollments of blind children in day and residential schools.

The CEC has had numerous discussions with all of the professional organizations in the Special Education field concerning its three-fold program outlined in this statement. In view of the vast array of testimony offered during the last two years at the seven regional hearings to the Congress, it is our considered opinion that the CEC legislative objectives best meet the expressed needs of all exceptionality groups. Congressional action in the Special Education field for scholarships and fellowships to all exceptionalities, for grants-in-aid to state programs and for a special education research program is a necessity that would complete the Federal government's already established efforts for handicapped people in its OVR and NIH programs.



